of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether there are a number of film stars in Tamil Nadu who we income tax dues in excess of Rs. 10 lacs; and

(b) if so, the names of these film stars and the amounts due from them?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI SATPAL MAHARAJ): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Name of the film stars of Tamil Nadu against whom income-tax demand exceedings Rs. 10 lakhs remained outstanding, as on 30.6.1997 are given below. The amount outstanding is also shown against their names.

Sl. No.	Name of the film star	Amount outstanding (Rs. in lakhs)
1.	R. Jayapradha	113.29
2.	R. Goundamani	78.91
3.	A. Sreedevi	77.44
4.	R. Senthil	41.36
5.	Muralikanthan	24.31
6.	S. Vijaya Shanthi	22.22
7.	Arjun	19.63
8.	P. Soundarya	17.27
9.	R. Raja Babu	15.45
10.	Srividya	12.13
11.	Khushboo	12.13
12.	K. Surekha	11.58
13.	K. Bhagyaraj	11.36
14.	S. Kamal Hasan	10.80
15.	T. Gauthami	10.17

Untraceable Companies Listed on Delhi Stock Exchange

*90. SHRI O.P. KOHLI: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether over 400 companies listed on the Delhi stock Exchange (DSE) are believed to be untraceable after raising Rs. 500 crore through public issue;

(b) if so, whether the DSE has been able to get the addresses of these companies from the Registrars of Companies (ROCs);

(c) if so, the details thereof;

(d) how were these companies registered by the ROCs without proper proof of their addresses; and

(e) action Government propose to take to ensure that the loopholes in the matter of getting a company registered are removed and the missing companies are traced to safeguard the interests of the small investors?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI SATPAL MAHARAJ): (a) to (c) According to Securities & Exchange Board of India (SEBI), Delhi Stock Exchange (DSE) is ascertaining the changed addresses of 406 companies. Out of these, DSE has ascertained the new addresses of 182 companies. With regard to reamaining, DSE has taken up the matter with the concerned Registrars of Companies.

(d) and (e) The Companies Act, 1956 has specific provisions under Section 146 requiring a company to intimate the situation of it's registered office and every change therein within 30 days to the Registrar of Companies.

Swindling of funds by Nationalised Banks

*91. SHRI BRATIN SENGUPTA: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the news item which appeared in The Hindustan Times, dated June, 5, 1997, captioned "28 nationalised banks involved in swindling Rs. 660 crore, Ministry report".

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto;

(c) whether is a fact that according to an internal report of the Finance Ministry more than Rs. 600 crore were swindled off by 28 nationalised banks during the period between March, 1993 and March, 1996; and

(d) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI SATPAL

MAHARAJ): (a) to (d) Government have seen the news item referred to in the question the information relating to number of frauds detected in public sector banks and the amounts involved therein during the years 1993, 1994, 1995 and 1996 (up to March) is as under:

	1993	1994	1995	1996 (upto March)
Number of frauds	2213	2266	1890	454
Amount involved (Rs. in lakhs)	32032.43	20007.88	11551.12	237267

+U.SH.9844000

The amounts involved in the cases of frauds do not necessarily represent the actual losses which the banks may have to ultimately suffer. The banks generally have some securities to cover advances made by them Banks also file civil and criminal suits and seek appropriate reliefs.

The Public Sector Banks at the instance of Government and RBI have taken several steps from time to time for prevention of frauds. These steps include issue of comprehensive guidelines by RBI for strengthening the control mechanism in banks, review of fraud cases on a continual basis by RBI, advising the banks of modus-operandi in ingenious cases alongwith required safeguards to prevent their recurrence, proper training of operational personnel and investigations and scrutiny into reported cases of major frauds as well as snap inspections covering systems and procedures and control arrangements in fraud prone areas by the RBI.

Misuse of House Building advance by Employees of State Bank of Indore

*92. SHRI GOVINDRAM MIRI: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1212 given in the Rajya Sabha on 12th March, 1996, and state:

(a) whether Government are aware that State Bank of Indore has reversed its decision to punish their employees against whom cases of misues of house building advance were proved; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor and the details of the revised action taken in each case?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI SATPAL MAHARAJ): (a) and (b) The State Bank of Indore has reported that it has taken disciplinary action against three employees (one since promoted as officer) posted in their branches in New Delhi/Delhi to whom house building advance were sanctioned and against who evidence of misutilisation was noticed. The disciplinary proceedings have since been completed against them. Out of the above three cases, one amployee did not file any appeal. The appellate authority has upheld the punishment in another case. However, in the third case, the punishment imposed by Disciplinary Authority for withholding of six increments with cumulative effect and stoppage of Cash Peon Allowance was reduced on appeal and the Cash Peon Allowance was restored. Further, the punishment of stoppage of six increments with cumulative effects was modified to stoppage of six increments without cumulative effect.

While disciplinary action against officers of State Bank of Indore is taken as per provisions in the State Bank of Indore (Officers) Service Regulations, 1979, action against workmen employees is however taken as provided in the various awards/settlements.

सी॰आर॰बी॰ घोटाले में बैंकों और निवेशकों को हुआ नुकसान

*93. **श्री राघवजी:** क्या वित्त मंत्री यह बताने कृपा करेंगे कि:

(क) सी॰आर॰बी॰ घोटाले के परिणामस्वरूप बैंकों और अन्य निवेशकों को कितना नुकसान उठाना पड़ा है;

(ख) क्या इस नुकसान के लिए भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक और "सेबी" की लापरवाही एवं अक्षमता भी कुछ हद तक जिम्मेदार है;

(ग) क्या जी॰आई॰सी॰ म्युचुअल फंड द्वारा प्राप्त की गई सालिसीटर जनरल आफ इंडिया की राय को वित्त मंत्रालय और भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक ने अनदेखा किया है; और

(घ) यदि नहीं, तो उस राय पर क्या लापरवाही की गई है?